

**REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES**

Claim 15 is amended. Claims 1-15 are pending in the application.

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all of the priority documents.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to state whether the drawings are acceptable.

Applicants acknowledge the indication that claims 4 and 5 define patentable subject matter and would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of their base claim and any intervening claims.

Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the following Remarks.

**35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Office Action rejects claims 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as supposedly being indefinite.

Applicants respectfully disagree,

The Office Action states that it is unclear whether “*separate shaving apparatuses*” are being claimed, and if they are being claimed in combination with each other.

Claim 13 claims “*an assortment of at least two shaving apparatuses.*” It seems perfectly clear to the undersigned attorney that “*separate shaving apparatuses*” are being claimed “*in combination with each other.*” Furthermore, claim 13 recites that each shaving apparatus is according to claim 1, so of course, they must each have a corresponding housing (so there are at least two housings in the assortment of claim 13) and a corresponding shell structure (so there are at least two shell structures in the assortment of claim 13). Claim 13 further recites that the two housings have mutually identical shapes, while the two shell structures have mutually different shapes. Applicants respectfully submit that there is nothing indefinite about this. Indeed, it is hard to imagine how the subject matter of claim 13 could be recited more clearly!

Meanwhile, claim 14 claims an assortment of at least one shaving apparatus

and at least two shell structures, each shell structure being separately mountable to the housing, and each shell structure having a mutually different shape. Again, Applicants respectfully submit that there is nothing indefinite about this, and again, it is hard to imagine how the subject matter of claim 14 could be recited more clearly.

Finally, claim 15 recites a method of manufacturing shaving apparatuses wherein the housings for the shaving apparatuses are manufactured to be the same, and the shell structures of the shaving apparatuses are manufactured to be different from each other. Again, Applicants respectfully submit that there is nothing indefinite about this, and again, it is hard to imagine how the subject matter of claim 15 could be recited more clearly.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

**35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103**

The Office Action rejects: claims 1, 8-10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over Taniguchi et al. U.S. Patent 6,568,083 ("Taniguchi"); and claims 2, 3, 6, 7 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Taniguchi in view of Muraguchi et al. U.S. Patent 6,430,813 ("Muraguchi").

Applicants respectfully traverse those rejections for at least the following reasons.

**Claim 1**

Among other things, the shaving apparatus of claim 1 includes: (1) a housing containing a motor and at least part of an electric power supply means, and carrying a drive structure; and (2) a shell structure enveloping at least a portion of the housing behind the at least one shaving head when mounted to the housing.

Applicants respectfully submit that Taniguchi does not disclose this combination of features. In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that Taniguchi does not disclose a shell structure enveloping at least a portion of the housing behind the at least one shaving head.

The Office Action cites element 12 of Taniguchi as supposedly corresponding to the recited housing, and cites element 14 of Taniguchi as supposedly

corresponding to the recited shell structure.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that element 14 of Taniguchi (described by Taniguchi as “upper shell 14”) does not envelop element 12 of Taniguchi (described by Taniguchi as “tube 12”). Indeed, Taniguchi teaches that upper shell 14 is attached to one end of tube 12 to form together the housing 10. (e.g., “*the upper shell 14 and the bottom cover 18 are secured to the tube 12 and suitable scaling rings interposed at the interfaces to form a watertight sealed main case*” – col. 6, lines 51-54). This plainly evident from inspection of FIGs. 2 and 3 of Taniguchi, which drawings also show the scaling rings (unlabeled) mentioned above.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Taniguchi.

Claims 8-10 and 12

Claims 8-10 and 12 depend from claim 1 and are deemed patentable over claim 1 for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, and for the following additional reasons.

Claims 8-10

Among other things, in the shaving apparatuses of claims 8-10, the housing includes at least a first operating member and the shell structure includes at least a second operating member operatively connected with the first operating member.

The Office Action cites col. 8, lines 59-64 of Taniguchi as supposedly disclosing these features.

Applicants respectfully disagree

The Office Action cites Taniguchi's upper shell 14 as supposedly corresponding to the upper shell structure of claims 8 & 9 that include a second operating member. However, the cited text at col. 8, lines 59-64 of Taniguchi does not make any mention at all of regarding upper shell 14! So the cited text cannot possibly disclose that the shell structure (again, cited by the Examiner as supposedly corresponding to upper shell 14) includes at least a second operating member operatively connected with the first operating member.

Therefore claims 8-10 are deemed patentable over Taniguchi for at least this additional reason, and in the case of claim 10, for the following further reason.

Claim 10

Among other things, in the shaving apparatus of claim 10, the second operating member is electrically connected with the first operating member.

Again, the Office Action cites col. 8, lines 59-64 of Taniguchi as supposedly disclosing these features.

Again, Applicants respectfully disagree.

The cited text makes no mention of any **electrical** connection. The text merely mentions an arrangement where an actuator of a switch button 25 has a mechanical "interconnection" with a power switch 26, and the switch 26 energizes the motor 40.

Accordingly, for at least this additional reason, claim 10 is deemed patentable over Taniguchi.

Claim 12

Among other things, in the shaving apparatus of claim 12, the shell structure is detachable from the housing.

The Office Action makes no mention of this feature! If the Examiner believes that Taniguchi discloses such a feature, a citation to something in Taniguchi is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that Taniguchi does not disclose any feature wherein a shell structure (cited by the Examiner as supposedly corresponding to upper shell 14) is detachable from the housing (cited by the Examiner as supposedly corresponding to tube 12). In contrast, Taniguchi teaches that the upper shell 14 is **secured to the tube 12** by sealing rings, and that the upper shell 14 and the tube 12 are sealed in a water-tight fashion (see, e.g., col. 6, lines 36-38, 51-54).

Accordingly, for at least this additional reason, claim 12 is deemed patentable over Taniguchi.

Claims 2, 3, 6, 7 and 11

Claims 2, 3, 6, 7 and 11 depend from claim 1. Muraguchi does not remedy

the shortcomings of Taniguchi as set forth above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claims 3, 6, 7 and 11 are deemed patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, and for the following additional reasons.

Claim 2

Among other things, in the shaving apparatus of claim 2, the shell structure extends at least from a face against which the at least one shaving head holder support is mounted to a power plug socket at an end of the housing opposite from the face against which the at least one shaving head holder support is mounted.

Even assuming *arguendo* that it was proper to combine Taniguchi and Muraguchi as proposed to add a power plug socket to Taniguchi's shaver, the combination would still not produce a shaving apparatus wherein a shell structure extends at least from a face against which the at least one shaving head holder support is mounted to a power plug socket at an opposite end of the housing.

Again, the Office Action cites element 12 of Taniguchi as supposedly corresponding to the recited housing, and cites element 14 of Taniguchi as supposedly corresponding to the recited shell structure.

Applicants respectfully submit that it is apparent that element 14 of Taniguchi does not extend at least from a face against which the at least one shaving head holder support is mounted to an opposite end of the housing, and cannot be modified to do so based on anything taught in Muraguchi.

Accordingly, no possible combination of Muraguchi and Taniguchi can produce the shaving apparatus of claim 2.

Claim 3

Among other things, in the shaving apparatus of claim 3, the shell structure **fully envelopes** the housing **at least** between the face against which the at least one shaving head holder support is mounted and **the power plug socket**.

At the outset, again, the Office Action cites element 12 of Taniguchi as supposedly corresponding to the recited housing, and cites element 14 of Taniguchi as supposedly corresponding to the recited shell structure.

Applicants respectfully submit that it is apparent that element 14 of Taniguchi

does not "fully envelope" any part of element 12 . . . and cannot be modified to do so based on anything taught in Muraguchi. Element 14 resides on and is connected to a top of element 12 to form Taniguchi's housing 10.

Furthermore, in similarity to the explanation above with respect to claim 2, element 14 does not extend least between the face against which the at least one shaving head holder support is mounted and the opposite end of the shaver, and certainly does not fully envelop element 12 at least between the face against which the at least one shaving head holder support is mounted and the opposite end.

Accordingly, no possible combination of Muraguchi and Taniguchi can produce the shaving apparatus of claim 3.

Applicants also traverse the statements of "design choice:" regarding claims 6 and 7, and submit that the Office Action does not mention the window in the shell structure that is recited in claim 11.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing explanations, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and reexamine the present application, allow claims 1-15 and pass the application to issue. In the event that there are any outstanding matters remaining in the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact Kenneth D. Springer (Reg. No. 39,843) at (571) 283.0720 to discuss these matters.

Respectfully submitted,

VOLENTINE & WHITT



By:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kenneth D. Springer  
Registration No. 39,843

VOLENTINE & WHITT  
One Freedom Square  
11951 Freedom Drive, Suite 1260  
Reston, Virginia 20190  
Telephone No.: (571) 283.0724  
Facsimile No.: (571) 283.0740